

ESTABLISHED 1857

九、七、六、五、四、三、二、一

1841

SH PP NG	
ARRIVALS.	
Sept. 16.	PHRA CHOM KLOO, British s 1,011 J. Fowler, Bangkok 7th Sept
General.	YUE PAT HONG.
Sept 18.	FIDELLIO, German str. 852.H B Nawehwang 9th Sept, and Chueko General. - M. GLORES & Co.
Sept. 18.	ARABIAN, British s. 122. 12

Sept. 18. **THALES**, British str., 830, H
Taiwan 13 h September, Amoy 14
Swatow 15 h. General.—**DOUGLAS**
FRANK & Co.
Sept. 16. **NIRAM**, British steamer 1815.
Longborne, R.N.R. Bombay 29 h
Singapore 10th Sept., General.—**P. &**

N. O.
 Sept. 16, DOCTOR, British bark, 310.
 C. O. Bangkok 8th Sept., 410.
 LUNN—
 Sept. 18, COSMOPOLITE, German steamer
 from London, 12th September, 17.
 WITTE & Co.
 Sept. 16, ABBINGTON, German str., 69.
 Wuhu 11th Sept. Rho.—S. M.—
 Sept. 16, T. Yee, German steamer, 232.
 Emise, Auswy 15th Sept., Ballantyne,
 & Co.
 Sept. 17, STORZ NORDSKY, Danish str., 5.
 Suenen, Siam 18th September—
 TELEGRAPH Co.
 Sept. 16, NICORO, German steamer, 70.
 Kohlen, Canton 16th Sept., Guss
 SHAWSON & Co.

CLEARANCES
 AT THE HARBOR MASTER'S OFFICE
 18th SEPTEMBER
 Afghan, British str., for Singapore.
 Chokonekion, German str., for Swatow.
 Dirian, German str., for Neuchang.
 Clifford, German str., for Hongkong.
 Diehm, German str., for Saigon.
 Yee of Peking, Amn. str., for Yokohama.
 Diamants, British str., for Amoy.
 Knappe, C. O. str., for Shanghai.
 Lynemore, German str., for Shanghai.
 Yiew g, British str., for Amoy.
 Meyene, British str., for Singapore.

DEPARTURES

Sept. 16, DROZ, Nor. str., for Kutubinozgu.
Sept. 16, IYOF PKEING, Amr. str., for Yk.
Sept. 16, DIAMO 72, British str., for Amoy.
Sept. 16, KUNG PAI, Chinm str., for Hsin.
Sept. 16, FIDELIO, German str., foranton.
Sept. 16, LY ENCOV, Ger. str., for Shanghai.
Sept. 16, YIKSANG, British str., for Amoy.

PASSENGER S.

ARRIVED.

Per *Phra Oom Clao*, str. from Bangkok.
Mrs. Cameron, Messrs O. erleick, J. G.
and J. F. Moller.

Per *Thib* str. from Tientsin, &c.—
and Mrs. Mayers, Messrs. Goulaud, H.
and O'Moller.

Per *Nizam*, str. from Bombay, &c.—10
P.M.

DEPARTED.
Per City of Peking, str. for Yokohama
Messrs. E. Gutz. W. Rudloff, Lt. Blake
R.M. for Vancouver. — Mr. H. S. Mann.
VISITS AT HOTELS.
HONOLULU HOTEL.
Mr. L. A. Bernholz, et
Mr. B. Friber
Mr. H. Francois
Mr. F. R. Roche
Mr. Ch. F. von Sant
Mr. Scherman

Mr. W. Stuart Harrison	Major E. & H. Schorn
Mr. G. R. Irwin	M. G. Schindler
Baron O. von Lowenstein	Mr. S. Schulz
Mr. D. Macfarlane	Mr. E. Stangen
Mr. H. P. Mann	Mr. & Mrs. J. Temm
Mr. Offermann	M. P. Tendorfen
Mr. Phillips	Major H. G. War
Mr. E. Prouss	Mr. Zeitner-Dietz
Countess Rechteren	

VICTORIA-HOTEL.

Mr. M. Alsborg	Mr. & Mrs. M. Leonard
Ex. Rector	

Mr. W. C. Friend	Mr. T. Medina
Capt. Galesworthy	Mons. & Madame Mes
Mr. & M. A. Glenday	Madame Marks
Mr. Leopold Grinberg	Mr. George Patton
Capt. Heidebrand	Mrs. C. H. Silfoni
Mr. F. W. Kirschaw	Mr. W. F. Waynon

MOUNT AUSTIN H. TEL.

Mr. A. Achelle	Mr. W. L. Gail
Hon. K. J. and Mrs. Aok-royd	Mr. H. Packney
Mr. H. Bent	Mr. Foote
	Mr. M. Reith

Mr. H. Boyer	Mr. F. S. Richards
Mr. J. McLeary Brown	Mr. A. Ross
Mr. Budios	M. dem. Schults
Mr. G. Centre	Mr. and Mrs. Saig
Mr. and Mrs. Cohen	children
Mr. Fenwick	Mr. A. H. Skelton
Hon. W. M. Goodman	Mr. & Mrs. Fraser Sm
Mr. Goosmann	Mr. and Mrs. Brad
Mr. & Mrs. Heemskerk	Smith
and children	Mr. & Mrs. J. D. Spen
Mr. & Mrs. J. D. Lapnik	Mr. Taylor

Mr. R. L. Muka
Mr. McKean
Mr. Mohler
Mr. Mueller
Mr. Nicolls
Mr. T. C. Nisbet
Mr. E. Ormiston
Mr. T. C. Ambler
Mr. O. Belch
Mr. J. F. Boulton
Mr. Terry
Mr. and Mrs. Lawin's
children
Mr. G. T. Veitch
Mr. A. G. Wood
Capt. Young
FRANK HOTTG.
Miss Harwick
Mr. Mixoloros
Mr. Louis Neutel

Mr. A. W. Brown	Mr. J. S. No es
Mr. J. H. Conghatie	Mr. R. M. No es
Mr. J. S. Pizick	Mr. G. J. Philippo
Mr. and Mrs. Ellis Fray	Mr. R. S. Swan
Mr. C. L. Gorham	Mr. G. L. Temlia
Mr. H. Grage	Mr. W. H. Wallace

VESSELS IN DOCK.

LABERDEN DOCKS.—
W. KOWLOON DOCKS.—H.M.S. Tweed,

TO-DAY.
Furniture Sale at Ross Hill, 2.30 p.m.
Meeting of China Traders Insurance Com-
pany, 4 p.m.
Regimental Band, Public Gardens, 8.30 p.m.

THE MOUNT-AUSTIN HOTEL.
A SELECT FAMILY and RESIDENTIAL HOTEL, situated 1,400 feet above the sea level, commanding on the one side a magnificent view of the Harbour with the Mainland in the distance, and on the other of hills and mountains, with a sea beyond dotted with islands as far as the eye can reach, over

The Hotel is replete with every accommodation for Families and Gentlemen. The Manager, Mr. ROBERT ISHERWOOD will be assisted by an efficient Lady Staff, and the Hotel will be conducted upon the best English system.

spa system. The accommodation comprises a spacious Dining Hall, private Dining Room, Drawing, Reading, Smoking, Grill, Billiard, and Private Sitting Rooms, with Fifty-four Bedrooms each provided with separate Bathroom and every convenience.

Tramway Tickets will be supplied to Visitors at Reduced Rates.

For terms apply to the SECRETARY at the COMPANY'S OFFICE 28 and 30, Queen's Road.

Central, Hongkong.
Hongkong, 1st June, 1891. [1891]

NOTICE.

HONGKONG AND WHAMPOA DOCK
COMPANY, LIMITED.

SHIPMASTERS AND ENGINEERS are

It is respectfully submitted that, if upon their arrival in this Harbour, none of the Company's Foremen should be at hand, orders for repairs if sent to the HEAD OFFICE, No. 14, Praya Central, will receive prompt attention.

In the event of complaints being found necessary, communication with the Undersigned is requested, when immediate steps will be taken to rectify the cause of dissatisfaction.

D. GILLIES

Secretary,
Hingham, 20th August, 1886.

MAIL SUPPLEMENT TO THE HONGKONG DAILY PRESS.

HONGKONG, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17th, 1891.

THE ICHANG RIOT.

In another column will be found, reproduced from the Shanghai papers, a full account of the riot at Ichang and of the troubles at other places. Hankow and Nanjing are evidently seething with anti-foreign sentiment, and throughout the Yangtze Valley there is widespread dissatisfaction with the Government. It is alleged that the next demonstration is to be made at Chungking, and as the presence of the steamer *Pachra* seems to have alone saved the foreigners at Ichang from massacre there is good ground for uneasiness as to the safety of the foreigners in Sin-chuen. It is now abundantly clear, from the published narratives of eye-witnesses of the riot at Ichang, that although the incendiary attack broke out unexpectedly it had been carefully designed and thought out. There was absolutely no pretext for the outbreak, and the one contrived was so transparent that it would hardly have imposed on the most ignorant and prejudiced even of Chinese mobs. A boy was seen one day to the Roman Catholic convent, and then a little later was demanded back by his friends as stolen. He was promptly handed over to them, and indignantly was baffled to construe this too even a colourable case of abduction. Yet the leaders of the riot endeavored to do as taking care, however, to follow it up by prompt action, for it is said that in less than half an hour after the first rush on the foreign buildings they were all in flames. As usual, the local official, proved utterly powerless to stay the progress of the riot, though the Chinese showed every disposition to prevent violence being done to persons and afforded his protection—which seems to have been of little value—to the Franciscan sisters, who were shamefully treated, and who on arrival at the river bank were actually hurled down by the soldiers they imagined were protecting them.

The most significant and at the same time most sinister feature of the proceedings at the Ichang riot undoubtedly is the open participation of the soldiers in them. Mr. COCKBURN, who was well known to and popular with the natives, on going to see if he could save some of his property, pushed his way through the crowd to get at his house, but was told by the soldiers that they could not help him, "soldiers were not strike soldiers," and "these are soldiers who are destroying the foreign houses." Indeed, it is evident that the active spirits at Ichang were soldiers without their coats, and as they are Hanna men it is highly probable that they were obeying orders from some person of authority who keeps in the background. The Chinese of Ichang in Hunan man, and though he was palpably anxious to save life he knew better than to attempt to interfere with the rioters. If he did not sympathize with their acts he at least refrained from opposition. The other officials were either helpless or indifferent, probably the latter, especially the Hsien, who was one of the most ardent opponents of the opening of the Upper Yangtze to steam navigation. Whether these Ichang officials were guilty of actual connivance with the rioters, as is broadly stated by the correspondent of one of our Shanghai contemporaries, might be difficult to prove, but there can be no question as to the inability of the Chinese Government to furnish protection to foreigners residing peacefully at the Treaty ports. They have just strongly asserted their ability to maintain order and afford efficient protection for the lives and persons of foreigners, yet here is a direct answer in the negative of the most pronounced kind. At a small town like Ichang, with a population of little over 50,000, they are unable, after repeated warnings, and although they must have known there was danger, to avert an outbreak, which, but for the timely presence in port of a small foreign steamer, would beyond doubt have ended in a savage massacre.

Now it is likely that the Ichang riot will prove the last of two outbreaks. It is openly declared among the natives that the intention of the Kolo Hut is to drive foreigners from every town and place in the Yangtze Valley, and unless the Foreign Powers take matters in their own hands there is every reason to believe the society will succeed in this object. They are a force in every province in Central China, and few of the officials dare openly oppose them. Indeed, it is more than probable that all the Hunan officials are pledged to assist them wherever possible without openly taking part in the disturbances. The Central Government are obviously afraid or unwilling to punish the real leaders of the riots or to degrade officials responsible for not suppressing them. Meanwhile to let the anti-foreign party are having the best of it. At Kichang and Hankow the foreigners are actually in a state of siege; at Nanjing all the foreigners are leaving, and missionaries at the way ports and other stations are being compelled to leave and seek some safe asylum, while the residents at Ichang have left almost in a body. It is quite impossible that matters can go on in this way long. Yet what is to be done? The Chinese offer inducements for losses suffered and promises of safety in the future. But the indemnities do not really reoup foreigners for their losses, and foreign residents can give no credit to the pledges of protection offered; they must live—if they elect to continue residence in China—in a constant state of uneasy insecurity. Such a position of things—entailing, too, the ceaseless waterfloods of the foreign naval authorities—must soon become intolerable; in fact, it is intolerable now. If the Treaty Powers cannot all unite in one common policy, then let England, France, and Russia, whose territories are all continuous on one side or another with the Chinese frontiers, take concerted action and either compel the Peking Government to agree to their terms

THE BLUE BOOK ON THE YAN-TZE RIVERS.

Consul GARDNER'S despatches in the blue book on the Yangtze rivers bring into prominence the excessive conduct of the Chinese officials in connection with the Wusueh affair, in which Messrs. ARDENT and GARDEN were murdered. One of the four mentioned by Mr. GARDNER, after stupidly neglecting the opportunity of nipping the riot in the bud, behaved well in its subsequent stages. This man was afterwards dismissed, his low rank no doubt rendering him in the opinion of the high authorities a convenient scapegoat, while the man who ruthlessly turned the ladies and children from his door and abandoned them to the fury of the mob, the other official who refused to send men to quell the disturbance, and the Customs official who declined to assist in having the bodies of the murdered Europeans brought to the landing place, are, so far as known, still retained at their posts. These three men may be taken as typical of the Chinese mandarins, who with rare exceptions cordially sympathize with the anti-foreign movement and so long as they could do so without compromising their official responsibility, would rather foment a riot than hold it in check. It is only fear of the consequences to themselves that induces the mandarins to afford any measure of protection, and so long as this is the case the exercise of strong pressure by the Foreign Powers is essential. If this pressure as applied to the Government at Peking proves ineffectual in the provinces it will become necessary to give it a more direct application. As Sir T. SALISBURY on behalf of the Marquis of Salisbury, told the Secretary of the Chinese Legation in London, "if public opinion became aroused and indignation in France and England, a cry for intervention might arise which might have very embarrassing and even serious consequences." The outrage on Dr. GARDNER in Kichang and the recent riot at Ichang are calculated to create both alarm and indignation and to raise serious doubts of the ability or willingness of the Chinese Government to hold its people in check. The Ichang affair especially shows that the forces which produced the previous riots are still active and are likely to lead to another outbreak at any moment.

The Chinese Minister in London appears to have exerted all his wiles to induce a complaisant attitude on the part of the Marquis of Salisbury. The Yamen, he said, felt that there had been no justice or equity in the measures taken, and the government had further excursions would lead to increase rather than allay popular excitement. The Marquis of Salisbury seemed inclined at first to take the bait, and in his telegram to Sir J. WALSHAM of the 17th July said: "They (the Yamen) are now, apparently, fully aware of the gravity of the occurrences that have taken place, and I am inclined to accept their assurance in this respect as sufficient if you are satisfied that the Chinese Government are sincere." Sir J. WALSHAM does not appear to have been satisfied, the Yamen claiming that the Minister in London said that "Her Majesty's Minister had been more urgent and severe in his representations than any other foreign representative," and that the principal sufferers, "this Sir J. WALSHAM, is as gratifying as it is surprising, and to induce him to take up such a strong position he must have been very deeply impressed with the urgency of the crisis." To say that the riots were instigated by a party inimical to the present dynasty is no answer to the demand of the Foreign Powers for protection to the lives and property of their subjects in China. If the Chinese Government cannot guarantee this protection it will become incumbent on the Foreign Powers to take such measures themselves as may be necessary to effect that end. But what is asked of China ought to be well within the power of any reasonably strong Government. It is not a host of executions of men of the coolie class that is demanded, but the proper punishment of the officials who refused to take such steps as were within their power to afford protection to the foreigners. And at this point there must be no statement of the demand. As Consul GARDNER says, next to the fear of a war, the only means to afford protection to foreigners is to make it a performance of their duty by the officials less unpleasant than the "regime of terror" which has been done by the constant exercise of vigilance and insistence on the prompt and severe punishment of any official guilty of neglect. Mr. GARDNER'S own action in relation to the Wusueh affair was altogether admirable, and his insisting that the Viceroy should be represented at the funeral of the victims and that the Viceroy should attend in person was a line of policy deserving of special commendation.

Our Peking correspondent, writing under date of the 28th August, gave the substance of the note signed by all the Foreign Ministers and presented to the T'ung-li Yamen on the 25th of that month. The note acquiesced in the indemnities for outrages on foreigners being arranged by the local authorities on the Yangtze, but required the punishment of the rioters and guarantees for the future to be settled between the foreign representatives and the T'ung-li Yamen. Nothing was said, so far as was known, about the opening of Hunan. The statement that the opening of that province was to be one of the terms of settlement was made by the *North-China Daily News*, which no doubt had what appeared to it to be sufficiently good authority for it. Should the

statement turn out to be inaccurate it will be very regrettable. Hunan is the hotbed of anti-foreign feeling and the fount from which poisonous literature is distributed throughout the Empire, and it is important that at the present juncture, when the persons and property of foreigners in Central China are being assailed by ignorant mobs, the province from which the mischief chiefly emanates should be firmly dealt with and have its fangs drawn. Mr. ARDENT, the Chief Agent of the National Bible Society of Scotland in China, has recently been on a trip in Hunan, and has written a short account of the province, which he describes as "beautifully diversified by mountain and plain, well watered and fertile. As a province, it is remarkably self-contained, producing an abundance of everything which the people require, and importing only luxuries. Its large exports of coal, iron, timber, rice, &c., bring in much wealth, which is greatly increased by the large number of Hunanese who, in all parts of the empire, in Government service or in business, are busily occupied in accumulating riches, which they ultimately carry home. In this inviting province, easy of access, healthy, and promising, Protestant missionaries have hitherto found it impossible to obtain a footing, while the Roman Catholic missionaries, established at one centre for three hundred years, and have in all that time done little more than simply hold their ground. The people Mr. ARDENT describes as strong and well-made, with a decidedly comfortable appearance; they pay great attention to education, are easily and straightforward, and from the great proportion of them who have travelled, are, for Chinese, exceedingly well-informed; but the writer mildly adds in closing his account, they are "somewhat turbulent." Their turbulence was shown the other day when they finally refused to allow the creation of the telegraph line the Viceroy CHANG CHANG-CHAO had ordered to be conducted through the province and forcibly drove out the telegraph parties. The *N. C. Daily News* in a recent article on the opening of Hunan says: "What is the unfortunate Chinese Government to do with this province? 'The Foreign Ministers say that it is to be made safe for foreigners to visit; but how 'is the Central Government to do it?' Our contemporary pains the difficulties in the way in rather loud voices, suggesting that the attempt will lead to civil war. The Governor-General, who is a man of simple force, but his best soldiers are Hunanese, who will not fight against their fellow provincials; and if it brings Li Huzhang's Anhui men from Tientsin there will be an actual civil war; Hunan will break out into open rebellion, and it will be a matter of time before the Government will be obliged to suppress it. In reply to all this we can only say that the Government which reconquered Kashgaria and subdued the Mohammedan rebellion in Yunnan ought to be able to enforce its decrees in the province of Hunan, the very heart of the Empire; if not, may it be the province of a commercial republic, made free by a stronger Government. It may be that to subdue a rebellion in Hunan would be the toughest piece of work Peking has had to undertake since the time of the T'ungling Rebellion, but the subjugation of the province would be greatly to the advantage of the dynasty, whose very existence is endangered by the semi-independent anarchy of the frontier provinces, who have grown impatient of Manchu rule."

THE PUNISHMENT OF PETTY CRIME AND FIRST OFFENCES.

At the meeting of the Ceylon Legislative Council on the 26th ultimo, the Governor in his opening speech of the session made certain references to matters connected with crime which may furnish useful suggestions for legislation in this Colony. Sir ARTHUR HAYDOCK has apparently no sentimental objection to flogging as a punishment for petty crime. He has, he says, been strongly impressed with the necessity of empowering Police Magistrates to inflict whipping for the commission of petty offences. This form of punishment is indeed prescribed in the Ceylon Penal Code, but under the procedure of the Criminal Procedure Code a Magistrate cannot inflict lashes except on offenders under sixteen years of age. Sir ARTHUR HAYDOCK has therefore caused a Bill to be drafted on the lines of the special legislation adopted in 1887 for putting down cattle stealing in the North-Western Provinces. The quickly extending cultivation of tobacco and other crops, and the daily increasing prevalence of the offences which it is sought to provide against, render it necessary, he says, that more adequate protection should be afforded to planters, both native and European, than the law now gives them. He does not state whether he has secured the assent of the Secretary of State to the introduction of such a Bill, but it is unlikely that he would venture on an innovation of this kind without being sure of his ground. And if the Secretary of State is willing to sanction flogging for petty offences in Ceylon, can he hardly have any logical ground for refusing to sanction it in this Colony. It is true we have no special provisions to protect in this Colony, but petty larceny is very prevalent, and quite recently a correspondent signing himself "Householder" sent us a letter complaining of the prevalence of petty crime, and all their findings. If flogging would prove more deterrent to this class of crime than imprisonment we would be glad to see it introduced. The Chinese in their own country are governed by the bamboo, and rightly or wrongly are supposed to be very amenable to the punishment of the cane. If we can do a little better, however, you must first catch him, and in his own interest he takes care not to commit his depredations under the eyes of the constable. As regards crime of the description in question we must confess we have more confidence in the efficient working of the law in this Colony than in the punishment, whether imprisonment or flogging, inflicted on the small proportion of thieves who are malevolent enough to let themselves be caught.

CUSTOMER'S BANKRUPTCY.

The sentence of six months' imprisonment passed by the Chief Justice on the bankrupt *BURTONS* was amply merited. Considering how the Court had dealt with the cases of *WORLDWIDE*, *APRILS*, *HO THIE*, and *WONG SIK LAM*, it would have been a miscarriage of justice if *BURTONS*, whose case was worse than that of those mentioned, had escaped punishment. Not only had the bankrupt been guilty of rash and hazardous speculation, but he had neglected to keep proper records of his transactions. It is impossible to believe that his failure to keep books was due merely to negligence. The bankrupt had already passed through the Court on a previous occasion, in 1876, when again was the subject of his speculation. Then, as in his recent speculations in shares, he proceeded on the "chance" I win falls you lose" principle, and is therefore refrained from keeping books by which his transactions could be clearly traced. On that occasion he received his order of discharge, but was admonished by the Court as to his failure to keep books; and as the Chief Justice pointed out on Thursday, having regard to that warning, to the fact that he was at one time a bank clerk and knew how to keep books, and the necessity of keeping them either himself or by a clerk, in omitting to keep books now, and in the manner he did his business, he might fairly be found to have wilfully and intentionally neglected to keep such books with the object of concealing his true state of affairs. For a man who comes to grief simply through rash and hazardous speculation it may be possible to feel some degree of pity; when a man deliberately neglects to keep a record of his transactions with the object of rendering any thorough investigation of his affairs impossible the element of intentionality is introduced.

In the new Bankruptcy Bill, which has been under the consideration of the Law Committee of the Legislative Council since December last, every note on the part of the bankrupt is constituted misdemeanour, punishable as to certain of them by imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding two years and as to the remainder by imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding one year. Under the present Ordinance the maximum punishment is one year's imprisonment without hard labour, and Mr. BURTONS probably has reason to congratulate himself that his case was disposed of under the old instead of the new law. Amongst the misdemeanours created by the new Bill, and under note on the part of the bankrupt, is the failure to keep proper books of account with intent to conceal the true state of affairs and defeat the law, is omitted. This is a point which should be set right before the Bill is finally passed into law. The section of the new Bill which would have directly applied to

BURTONS is, however, in that which provides that a bankrupt shall be liable to a fine of not more than £500, or to imprisonment for not more than six months, or to both, unless the jury is satisfied that the insolvent arose from misfortune or mismanagement, or from any other cause, and that he was not guilty of any offence under the new law. *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and it is not likely that he would have been acquitted had he been tried under the new law. His failure to keep proper books of account and his inability or refusal to give any explanation as to some \$40,000 drawn from the bank by cheque in his own favour, *BURTONS*, as already mentioned, was accompanied by reckless speculation, and

to the adjoining outpouring detaching
bed in; two trumpets were blown, and
singing his breast shouted out, "Come on
slay the foreigners; I am willing to die
The riot had commenced; yet up to
moment so paltry, did the whole thing
and so little sign was there of anything
going to happen, that the coolies whom
Mr. Soverby had carrying earth in the
a never left off their work or wen to
was doing next door.

